

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 2, 8, and 17-20 are amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry of the amended claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 4-6, 8 and 16-21 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Claims 2, 8, and 17-20 are amended herein to respectively clarify an event-driven information display system, a client, a method, a storage, and a medium, using claim 2 as an example, that " determines that said client is on-line, said client transmits to said server correlation information that is defined corresponding to said event detected by said event detecting section without reading out the previously received display information from said storage section, and receives new display information sent from said server based on said correlation information to display it.

Claims 2, 8, 17, and 19-20 are also amended herein to clarify a system, a client, a method, a storage, and a medium "wherein when said on-line condition determining section determines that said client is off-line, said client reads out from said storage section the previously received display information."

No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry of the amended claims are respectfully requested.

CURRENT ACTION IS INCOMPLETE

Applicants respectfully submit that the current office action is incomplete. The Examiner has not responded to some of the Applicant's arguments (presented in the Amendment filed September 13, 2005 and entered by the RCE filed November 14, 2005) traversing rejections in the Office Action mailed June 13, 2005 and in part repeated in the current Office Action.

As set forth in MPEP §707.07(f) entitled Answer All Material Traversed:

an examiner must provide clear explanations of all actions taken by the examiner during prosecution of an application.

The previous Amendment argued that an *arguendo* combination of the cited art does not discuss features recited by the claims since Jones first uses code in one's own machine, and if the operation is not accomplished, code is then obtained from another machine.

Applicants submit that the current Action is incomplete in that the Examiner did not provide a complete response to this argument. As set forth in MPEP § 706.07(d):

(i)f, on request by applicant for reconsideration, the primary examiner finds the final rejection to have been premature, he or she should withdraw the finality of the rejection.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that if the claims are not found immediately allowable that a new Office be sent including a complete response and with the response date accordingly reset.

TRAVERSE OF REJECTION

The Examiner rejects claims 2, 4-6, 8, and 16-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brassil (U.S. 2002/0107940) and Jones (US 2002/0091874).

The rejections are traversed.

Recited Features Not Taught By Cited Art, Alone Or In Combination

Applicants submit that features recited by each of independent claims 2, 8, and 17-20 are not discussed by the art relied on by the Examiner, alone or in combination, and that *prima facie* obviousness is not established.

I. Independent claims 2, 8, and 17-20 respectively recite a system, a client, a method, a storage, and a medium, using claim 2 as an example, "wherein when . . . determines that said client is on-line, said client transmits to said server correlation information that is defined corresponding to said event detected by said event detecting section without reading out the previously received display information from said storage section, and receives new display information sent from said server based on said correlation information to display it (emphasis added)."

Further, claims 2, 8, 17, and 19-20 also respectfully recite an event-driven information display system, a client, a method, a storage, and a medium "wherein when said on-line condition determining section determines that said client is off-line, said client reads out from said storage section the previously received display information."

These features are not taught by the cited art.

The Examiner incorrectly contends that since Brassil discusses in paragraph [0086] that "(t)he media server can include server cue handling mechanism for inserting cues into the media stream. The receiver can include a client cue handling mechanism (CCHM) for detecting cues and cues for certain applications (e.g. Recording a program)" it follows that:

one ordinary skill in the art . . . knows that the media server has a choice of adding cues so in other word(s) its an option and that can be interpreted as "event detecting section without reading out display information from said storage section".

(Action at page 7).

Applicants submit that even given *arguendo* that Brassil's cited discussion in paragraph [0086] teaches an insertion of a cue is an "option," Brassil does not discuss the recited features

according to an aspect of the present invention of a condition that upon determining that the client is on-line that:

(1) a client transmits to said server correlation information which is defined corresponding to said event detected by said event detecting section and that such transmission is; and

(2) such transmission is without reading out display information from said storage section.

II. Further, claim 2, 8, and 17-20 recite, using claim 2 as an example, "an on-line condition determining section determining whether said client is on-line or off-line."

The Examiner incorrectly contends this feature is discussed by a modification of Brassil since Jones disclosed in paragraph [0082]:

(a) transmitting machine includes in the marshaled object an identification of the type of the object transmitted, the data constituting the state of the object and a network accessible location in the form of URL that is associated with the object.

(Action at page 8.)

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's conclusion is not correct and even an *arguendo* combination of the art does not discuss such a determining of an on-line condition.

Applicants submit, rather, that merely including a URL does not discuss that a client is online. For example, by the Examiner reading a URL included in these remarks, e.g., "http://www.uspto.gov/" does not mean that the Examiner necessarily "is online."

III. Claim 2, 8, and 17-20 as an example, further recite that the client first tries to access a server outside the client to acquire information, but when the access to the server is not accomplished, the stored information is then used.

This feature is not discussed by an *arguendo* combination since Jones discusses instead in paragraph [0082] that "(i)f code 620 for the object is not resident or available, machine 603 requests the code from another machine using the URL."

That is, in contrast to the present invention, Jones first uses code in one's own machine, and if the operation is not accomplished, code is then obtained from another machine.

IV. Example Of Advantages According To An Aspect Of the Present Invention

Further, for the convenience of the Examiner in assist in distinguishing the present invention over the cited art., the following illustration is provided. According to an aspect of the present invention, code is first used in another machine.

Instead, Jones merely teaches first using code in one's own machine and if the operation is not accomplished, then code is obtained from another machine.

However, Applicants submit that such a method can present problems. For example, by first referring to data in one's own machine, there is a possibility that data is obtained, which is older than obtainable from another machine. To assist in avoiding this possibility, Jones must add additional components and/or operations, e.g., a mechanism comparing data in one's own machine and those in another machine and determining the newest data is required. Such additional components or operations are not required according to an aspect of the present invention.

In a case of use of a commercial data base, if information in one's own machine is first read out and such information is altered by a third party, Jones does not teach measures to address such a situation. For example, if both one's own machine and another's machine have advertisements and the malicious third party(e.g., virus, spyware) alters the advertisement to another, the system taught by Jones would display the affected advertisement. However, according to the aspects of the present invention the advertisement is not affected.

Summary

Since features recited by claims 2, 4-6, 8, and 16-21 are not taught by the cited art, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 2, 4-6, 8, and 16-21 allowed.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

May 15, 2006

By:

Paul W. Bobowiec
Paul W. Bobowiec
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501